



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/605,881	06/29/2000	Christian Laroque	Q59841	7314

7590 08/13/2004

Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERTA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/605,881

Applicant(s)

LAROQUE ET AL.

Examiner

Roberta A Stevens

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. 6463259 B1) in view of Kelly (U.S. 2002/0126678 A1).

3. Regarding claim 1, Kim teaches (col. 3) a method of monitoring the use of a chargeable dynamic signaling port of a trunk connecting two exchanges, wherein applications communicate via said exchange and the port, comprising: assigning rights of use of a chargeable dynamic signaling port of a trunk connecting two exchanges, an application; and if the port has not been activated, setting up an assigned port, of the trunk for use by the application or if the port has already been set up, making an assigned port available for immediate use only by the application.

4. Kim does not teach the port is set up and deactivated on demand.

5. Kelly teaches (page 4, table 1) in a call set up process the port is set up and deactivated on demand. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt to Kim's system the activation and deactivation of a port on demand to allow as soon as possible reuse of those resources once the port is deactivated.

Art Unit: 2665

6. Regarding claim 2, Kim teaches (column 4-5) informing applications likely to require to use a changeable dynamic signaling port that a port of this kind has been set up to enable the application to use the port.
7. Regarding claim 5, Kim teaches (col. 3) the rights assigned to each application are stored in a database (routing table) for the exchange initiating the call request.
8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. 6463259 B1) in view of Kelly (U.S. 2002/0126678 A1) and further in view of Chiang (U.S. 6335938 B1).
9. As mentioned above Kim and Kelly teach all of the limitations of claim 1.
10. Kim and Kelly teach a provision for assigning rights of use in time periods that can be changed.
11. Chiang teaches (abstract) teach a provision for assigning rights of use in time periods that can be changed (column 3, lines 58-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt to Kim and Kelly's system, Chiang's concept of assigning time to the use of ports to avoid delay in the system.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2665

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

15. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2665

16. Any inquiry concerning the communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberta Stevens at (703) 308-6607. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 p.m.

17. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached on (703) 308-6602.

18. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

19. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306

For informal draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Roberta A. Stevens

Patent Examiner

08-06-04



HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600